United Nations A/C.1/56/PV.18

General Assembly
Fifty-sixth session

Official Records

First Committee
18th meeting
Tuesday, 30 October 2001, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Erdös ..... (Hungary)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Alcalay (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 64 to 84

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Acting Chairman: In accordance with the adopted programme of work and timetable, this afternoon the Committee will commence the third phase of its work, namely action on all draft resolutions submitted under agenda items 64 to 84 as approved this morning. As I mentioned at that meeting also, the Committee will proceed this afternoon to take action on draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No. 1, which all members have received, under cluster 1, Nuclear weapons, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

After completing action on draft resolutions in cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, as approved. In cluster 2, other weapons of mass destruction, we will start with draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32.

At this stage I should like to inform the Committee that at the request of the delegation of Sri Lanka this morning, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.7, under cluster 3, Outer space (disarmament aspects), has been postponed to a later stage of the work of the Committee.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on those draft resolutions contained in the cluster that we are going to discuss this afternoon, that is cluster 1, I should like once again to review the procedure that was outlined last Friday for this phase of our work. At the outset of each meeting, delegations will have an opportunity to introduce revised draft resolutions. I will then call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements or comments, other than in explanation of their position or vote, on the draft resolutions in a particular cluster.

Thereafter, delegations will have an opportunity to explain their position or vote on the draft resolutions before a decision is taken.

After the Committee has taken a decision on a draft resolution, I will call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution on which a decision has just been taken.

Therefore, delegations will have two opportunities to explain votes or positions on a particular draft resolution: before or after a vote is taken. In accordance with the rules of procedure, sponsors of draft resolutions are not permitted to make statements in explanation of vote.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, I would urge those delegations wishing to request a recorded vote on a particular draft resolution kindly to inform the Secretariat of their intention as early as possible and

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-61118 (E)

before the Committee begins its action on any individual cluster.

With regard to any deferment of action on any draft resolution, delegations should also inform the Secretariat in advance. Every effort should be made to refrain from resorting to a deferment of action. Again, please inform us in advance so that we can make provisions in each case.

I hope these procedures are clear to all delegations at the meeting this afternoon so that we can proceed to active implementation of the draft resolutions.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, Nuclear weapons, I call on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

There being none, I now call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments, other than in explanation of their position or vote, on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, Nuclear weapons.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As I understand we can make general comments on draft resolutions in cluster 1, my delegation has asked for the floor in order to make clear once again its general position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We feel it is appropriate to make this general statement so as to avoid as much as possible repeating explanations of vote when the Committee takes action on draft resolutions and separate paragraphs, included in this cluster, that refer in one way or another to the NPT. However, we reserve the right to make additional explanations on specific votes when certain draft resolutions or separate paragraphs referring to the NPT are adopted, if we deem it necessary.

The NPT is essentially discriminatory. It legitimizes the possession of nuclear weapons by a very small select club of countries, as it were. The nuclear Powers legitimized by the NPT do not even have to subject their installations and nuclear arsenals to international safeguards. Moreover, the Treaty does not prohibit vertical proliferation, thus allowing the nuclear Powers it recognizes to constantly develop their weapons. That is why Cuba has not yet acceded to the NPT. Our country will continue, in an open and transparent way, to develop its nuclear programme for peaceful purposes and will tirelessly seek nuclear disarmament and the elimination of all nuclear weapons. This is the only way to ensure that the existence of humanity is no longer at risk.

Although it is not a party to the NPT, all Cuba's nuclear installations are presently under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. We respect all the rules and regulations scrupulously. In 1999, in particular, Cuba signed an additional protocol under the IAEA safeguards regime. Cuba's decision to participate as an observer at the Sixth Review Conference of the NPT once again demonstrated the interest and serious-mindedness with which my country has been following all issues involving disarmament and non-proliferation.

Some States, fortunately a minority, have expressed great optimism as a result of the Sixth Conference. We fully respect the right of all countries to reach their own conclusions. But we do not think that we should rest on our laurels especially as no deadline has been established to eliminate the 35,000 remaining nuclear weapons that today threaten us all.

For these reasons, Cuba will not vote in favour of certain draft resolutions and separate paragraphs in this cluster that refer to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and do not accord with our position.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to speak? I see none, so I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): Pakistan fully shares the security concerns of Arab countries vis-à-vis Israel and supports efforts towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Therefore Pakistan will support the draft resolution introduced by Egypt in document A/C.1/56/L.5.

The Acting Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October 2001.

The Acting Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5 have expressed the wish that it

be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", as it has done for the last 20 years, notwithstanding substantive and important reservations regarding certain elements in the draft resolution.

The policy of Israel has always maintained that the nuclear issue, as well as all regional security issues, conventional and unconventional, should be dealt with in the full context of the peace process. Israel supports the eventual establishment of a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It should also be free of chemical and biological weapons as well as ballistic missiles. Israel believes that the political realities in the Middle East mandate a practical step-by-step approach. This should begin with modest confidence-building measures, be followed by the establishment of peaceful relations enriching reconciliation, and be, possibly, complemented by conventional and unconventional arms control measures. That process could eventually lead to more ambitious goals such as establishing a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction.

As the international community has recognized, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be based on arrangements freely arrived at among all the States of the region concerned. Israel believes that such a zone can be established only through direct negotiations among the States of the region after they recognize each other and have established full, peaceful and diplomatic relations among themselves. It cannot be established other than by the parties themselves. Nor could it be established in a situation where some States maintain that they are in a state of war with each other, refuse in principle to maintain peaceful relations with Israel, or even recognize its right to exist.

In this context it should be recalled that in the Middle East, unlike other regions in the world where nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established, there are continuing threats by elements in the region and beyond against the very existence of one State in the region, Israel. That has a critical impact on the region's ability to establish such a zone. In view of the present reality our efforts in the context of this draft resolution should be focused on the creation of a stable environment of peace and reconciliation in the Middle East. Israel will continue to dedicate all its efforts to achieve this goal. We call upon our neighbours to do the same.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no other delegation wishes to explain its position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.12.

If no delegation wishes to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.12.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.12, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.12 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Namibia, Nauru, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon,

Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, China, Japan, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Turkmenistan, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.12 was adopted by 90 votes to 42, with 11 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Nigeria and Zambia informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): I had wanted to make an explanation of vote before the vote but missed out. Pakistan voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.12 because it is opposed to the use of nuclear weapons or any other weapons contrary to the United Nations Charter. We believe that the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons flows from the provision in the United Nations Charter which calls upon States not to use or threaten to use force, whether nuclear or conventional, in their relations.

Mr. McGinnis (United States of America): As we do each year with similar draft resolutions, the United States has today voted against draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.12. Notwithstanding our commitment to nuclear disarmament, the United States would never negotiate, approve or sign a convention of the type called for in A/C.1/56/L.12. Such a convention is simply not a practical approach to the question of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The considerable progress towards that goal that has been achieved to date has been made by a realistic, step-by-step process that embraces bilateral, unilateral and multilateral measures. My delegation is convinced that this process can continue to bear fruit in the years ahead.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no other delegation wishes to explain its position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.14.

I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.14 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): The best way to reduce nuclear danger is the total elimination of all nuclear weapons. Until that can be achieved we support such confidence-building measures, arms control and disarmament measures as can equitably and effectively reduce the danger of the use of nuclear weapons. Although we entertain reservations on some of the provisions of the draft resolution, the delegation of Pakistan will vote in favour of the text since we strongly support the objectives of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/56/L.14.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): As no other delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.14.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.14, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.14 are

listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Cuba, Haiti, Madagascar, Namibia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, China, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.14 was adopted by 89 votes to 43, with 13 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

As no delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/56/L.15.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/56/L.15 before a decision is taken. There appear to be none.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/56/L.15.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.15, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October 2001. The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/56/L.15 are listed in the draft decision itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, Ireland has become a sponsor of the draft decision.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/56/L.15 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.15 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no representatives wish to explain their vote or position on the draft decision just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17.

I call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17

before a decision is taken. There appear to be none. The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.17 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no delegation wishes to explain its position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.26.

Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.26? There being none, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.26.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.26, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 13th meeting on 23 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.26 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, Brunei Darussalam has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.26 was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 52 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Lee Kie-cheon (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.26. We have long discussed the issue of negative security assurances from two different perspectives in the First Committee, the review conferences of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Conference on Disarmament. One approach is to deal with this issue in the context of nuclear disarmament. The other approach assumes that any international norm should allow for differential treatment in all countries until universal adherence and full compliance is ensured. In our view the primary issue here centres on to whom and in what form security assurances will be given. My delegation has upheld the principle that non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT that fully comply with its provisions, in particular those contained in articles II and III, have a legitimate right to receive assurances from nuclear-weapon States that the latter will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. Likewise, nuclear-weapon States have a corresponding obligation to provide such assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, but only to those in compliance with the NPT provisions. These mutual responsibilities, required of all States parties to the NPT, will doubtless contribute to strengthening the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

On the issue of form, my delegation has considered the options expressed by those in favour of a single international instrument and those in favour of bilateral, regional or other approaches. While the Republic of Korea recognizes the need to address this issue more closely, it believes that if the principles that address these aforementioned mutual responsibilities are firmly established, it could be flexible on the issue of form. As we do not feel that this draft resolution adequately reflects these concerns, my delegation abstained in the voting.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no other delegation wishes to explain its position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): My delegation is taking the floor to explain Pakistan's vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31. Pakistan believes that a ban on the production of fissile materials can be promoted only through a universal, non-discriminatory and internationally verifiable treaty negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament. Pakistan was able to support General Assembly resolutions 48/75 L of 1993, 53/77 I of 1998 and 55/33 Y of 2000. We have agreed to open talks on a fissile material treaty in the Conference on Disarmament which will address both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation aspects. As envisaged in the Shannon report, Pakistan will seek a solution to the problem of existing unequal stockpiles in the course of the negotiations. Pakistan agrees that the Conference on Disarmament should adopt a programme of work that includes negotiations on such a fissile material treaty.

Since draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31 is consistent with our policy, Pakistan will be happy to join in the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no other delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31, under agenda item 74, "General and complete disarmament", entitled "The Conference on Disarmament decision (CD/1547) of 11 August 1998 to establish, under item 1 of its agenda entitled 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament', an ad hoc committee to negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October 2001. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Grenada,

Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Monaco, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38.

I call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I wish to make an explanation of vote on the previous draft resolution on the fissile material cut-off.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): On the previous draft resolution that the Committee has already dopted? If there is no objection I will call on the representative of Israel.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.31 because it believes that the objective of a fissile material cut-off treaty is subsumed under the Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone concept. Israel's approach to this concept was elaborated a few minutes ago in our delegation's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.5, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". In practical terms, the modalities of this draft resolution cannot be assessed in isolation from the peace process in all its aspects and the overall effort to reduce tension, curb proliferation and limit armaments in our region.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Although the Committee has already moved on to the next draft resolution, I would be ready to call on other delegations to speak on the previous draft resolution if any so desire. As no other delegation wishes to speak, we can now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): Last year my delegation made a statement in the meeting of the Committee expressing our reservations on the results of the Fifth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Subsequently, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution relating to the Conference. For the same reason, we wish to dissociate ourselves from draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38 and will abstain in the voting on it.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): If no other delegations wish to explain their vote or position before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38, entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October 2001. In this connection, I draw the attention of members to a "Note by the Secretariat concerning the responsibilities entrusted to the Secretary-General under draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38", which is contained in document A/C.1/56/L.55.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Mr. Seetharam (India): My delegation requests that a vote be taken on this draft resolution.

The Acting Chairman: The delegation of India has requested a vote. In that case I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh,

Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Cuba, Israel, Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.38 was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Seetharam (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its position after the voting on the draft resolution. My delegation's views on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are well known. The NPT remains discriminatory, and has therefore proved to be inadequate and ineffective. The proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems has continued unabated while the commitment under article VI remains unimplemented. The optimism witnessed in some quarters at the outcome of the 2000 NPT Review Conference has proved to be short-lived, with unequivocal undertakings not being honoured. We have not seen any progress in the Conference on Disarmament in commencing any substantive and meaningful negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The draft resolution under consideration seeks to welcome the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, a document that makes a number of unacceptable and unwarranted references to my country, a non-party to the NPT, that my delegation rejects unequivocally in their entirety. My delegation has therefore cast a negative vote on the draft resolution.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45.

Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45?

Mr. Meléndez-Barahona (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): As with similar draft resolutions in previous years, I would like El Salvador to be added to the list of sponsors.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): El Salvador will be added to the list of sponsors.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45.

A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote on operative paragraph 1 has also been requested.

The Committee will first take a decision on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45, under agenda item 74 (v), "General and complete disarmament", and entitled

"Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: El Salvador, Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Qatar and Uruguay.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45, which reads as follows:

> "*Underlines once again* the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control:".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45 was retained by 139 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45 as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic,

Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45 as a whole was adopted by 99 votes to 28, with 19 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's position in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

First, we highly appreciate Malaysia's sincere attitude and firm commitment to nuclear disarmament, which led to its proposing draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45. Japan believes that because of the immense power of nuclear weapons to cause destruction, death and injury to human beings, their use is clearly contrary to the basic humanitarianism that gives international law its philosophical foundation. Therefore, we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never be used again and continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), which this draft resolution addresses, demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the judges of the ICJ on the existing obligation under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on that matter in good faith. Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to achieve steady and step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

From that point of view, we believe, with reference to operative paragraph 2, that it is rather premature to call "upon all States immediately to fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations in 2002 leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons ...".

We believe that practical steps should be pursued with intensity before embarking upon the negotiation that draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45 calls upon all States to commence. That is the reason for Japan's abstention on the draft resolution. Finally, Japan continues to encourage every effort to advance nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Sanders (Netherlands): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Benelux countries — Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands — as well as on behalf of the following countries which have associated themselves with this explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*": Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal and Spain.

We welcome and support the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in its advisory opinion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. For that reason, we voted in favour of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. Although we share the intent of the draft resolution that the ultimate aim of nuclear disarmament is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we cannot support the draft resolution as a whole. We regret that in this draft resolution only one element of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice is quoted. The advisory opinion is indivisible and should be considered as a whole.

Furthermore, it is our firm belief that nuclear disarmament can only be reached on a step-by-step

basis and by a gradual process. Last year, at its Sixth Review Conference, the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) unanimously agreed on a set of practical measures in this respect. The international community should now focus on implementing these practical measures.

Mr. McGinnis (United States of America): The United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45 as a whole, as well as in the separate vote on operative paragraph 1. The draft resolution attempts to justify negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention using the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*. The United States position on this draft resolution remains unchanged. We oppose it because we remain convinced that the step-by-step process of unilateral, bilateral and multilateral efforts that is under way is yielding significant results in the area of nuclear disarmament. This step-by-step process remains for the time being the only realistic approach in this highly complex field.

The responsibility to conduct negotiations in good faith leading towards the elimination of nuclear weapons comes from article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), not from the ICJ advisory opinion. As ongoing unilateral and bilateral efforts continue to make real progress in reducing nuclear weapons, a multilateral process, the long-awaited negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the fissile material cut-off treaty, would continue progress towards nuclear disarmament. None of these processes uses or was set in motion by the ICJ advisory opinion. The results of these negotiations are not affected by the ICJ advisory opinion. To put it directly, the ICJ advisory opinion is only advisory, not binding.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.48.

As no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.48.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.48, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", was introduced by the representative of Uzbekistan at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October 2001.

The Acting Chairman: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/56/L.48 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.48 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman: Does any delegation wish to explain its position on the draft decision just adopted? There appear to be none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): I wish to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32. Egypt has traditionally supported all measures leading to the promotion of international and regional stability and has always committed itself to engage in constructive action in fulfilment of that objective. From that standpoint we cannot but sympathize with the general thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32. It addresses a global instrument which aims at prohibiting a whole category of weapons of mass destruction, namely chemical weapons, thus making the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) effective in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Nevertheless, Egypt would like to stress once again its well-known position vis-à-vis the Convention and its implications in the Middle East region. Our commitment to the prohibition of chemical weapons and all weapons of mass destruction is set out vividly in President Mubarak's 1990 initiative on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction. In it, he underscored the following elements: first, a total prohibition in the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction without exception, be they nuclear, chemical or biological; and secondly, a solemn declaration by all States in the region, without exception, of reciprocal commitment and obligation in this regard.

That prompted the Security Council to support our initiative, as mentioned in its resolution 687 (1991) and in the Security Council statement of 1992. We believe in this regard that priority must be given to freeing the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction in order to increase the security of the

States of the region and to achieve comprehensive and lasting peace. That lasting peace cannot be achieved through a qualitative edge or military superiority but through dialogue, negotiations and a deep commitment to peace and equal security.

Although Egypt participated actively in the long and arduous negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament that led to the elaboration of the provisions of the CWC, it has voiced its position since day one, when the Convention opened for signature in January 1993 at the Paris Conference. Indeed, our standpoint emanates from and is firmly based on our regional considerations and concerns. We will continue to decline to sign the CWC until Israel joins the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Egypt acted in good faith and ratified the NPT in 1980, and it has remained faithful to the regime since then by working to consolidate it; it is now Israel's turn to act likewise.

Despite all these considerations, my delegation did not request a recorded vote on this draft resolution. However, we do not consider ourselves to be party to any consensus decision that will be taken on this draft resolution today and would like to register our reservation on the content of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to convey our support for draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32. As a party to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and a member of the Executive Council of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), we would like to underline the importance of the Convention. We also note that a number of States parties have yet to submit their initial declarations to the OPCW. We would also like to underscore the need for the early destruction of chemical weapons by certain States which, even after adhering to the CWC, have not declared the destruction of their chemical weapons.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 24 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF/2.

The Acting Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.32, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction" (CWC). Israel signed the Convention and participated actively in the Preparatory Commission in order to shape the Convention into a workable mechanism. By signing the Convention, Israel reflected its moral vision and commitment to a world free of chemical weapons. Unfortunately, while Israel signed the Convention in January 1993, other countries in the region, including those that have used chemical weapons in the past or are believed to be working to improve their chemical capability, failed to follow suit and have indicated that their position would remain unchanged even if Israel ratified the Convention.

The reason Israel has not yet ratified the CWC relates to Israel's unique geopolitical environment. We wish to recall that at the signing ceremony in 1993, Israel made it clear that it would seek to ratify the Convention subject, inter alia, to regional security concerns. The threat of chemical warfare against Israel's population has not diminished since then, and remains to this day. In fact, the overall regional security concern has actually increased. We wish to reaffirm Israel's view that positive changes in the security climate in the Middle East will be the major consideration for Israel regarding the issue of ratification.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33/Rev.1.

I call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33/Rev.1 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Tovar (Dominican Republic) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Dominican Republic naturally joins the consensus on the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", but would like to outline its position so that it will be reflected in the record.

The Dominican Republic, as an island State, has reason to believe it is vulnerable to the transport of radioactive wastes and to the dumping of nuclear wastes and other dangerous substances. My country attaches special importance to the environment, and we are conscious of the risks and threat to our marine and coastal environment, to our ecological equilibrium and to our natural resources posed by the transport of nuclear wastes. Therefore, the Dominican Republic has always participated actively in efforts to ensure that international shipping and airline companies comply fully with international agreements on the transport of wastes and other dangerous substances.

The Dominican Republic welcomes the First Committee's recognition, once again, that the question of peace and security and the issue of development are interdependent and indivisible. We are also confident that, given the risks to the environment and the economy, and the vulnerability of many of our countries to them, there will arise a greater awareness and understanding of the concerns of the small island States with respect to keeping their natural maritime environment free of the danger of pollution that can take place during the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): My delegation supports the main objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33/Rev.1, which are rooted in legitimate concerns. Pakistan takes its responsibilities in the area of the safety of nuclear materials with the utmost seriousness. That is evident from our membership in several safety-related conventions. Pakistan has also established an effective regulatory body known as the Pakistan Nuclear Regulatory Authority, which ensures the highest standards of physical protection and safety of nuclear facilities and materials. However, on various occasions we have duly recorded our reservations with regard to the Joint Convention. Our support for the draft resolution, therefore, does not constitute an endorsement of the relevant paragraphs, that is, the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8, of this draft resolution dealing with that Convention.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", was introduced by the representative of Sudan, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October 2001.

The Acting Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Seetharam (India): My delegation has requested the floor after the adoption, without a vote, of this draft resolution, to state its position with regard to operative paragraph 8.

India has been fully supportive of the central objective of the draft resolution, and has therefore joined in the consensus. India was among the few countries which supported the retention of radiological weapons on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, as it believes that the international community must remain vigilant with respect to the grave dangers posed by nuclear or radioactive wastes and the possibility of their military use.

Operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution refers to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. As a developing country, India places high importance not only on safety, but also on full utilization of all aspects of the fuel cycle to derive maximum benefits. Therefore, spent fuel is not a waste but a valuable resource, a position that India has been consistently supporting at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Therefore, while joining the

consensus, my delegation thought it fit to clarify our position on operative paragraph 8 so that it is reflected in the record.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The next meeting of the Committee will continue to consider draft resolutions in informal working paper No. 2, which was recently distributed to the members of the Committee.

Does any other delegation wish to speak?

Mr. Sanders (Netherlands): With regard to informal working paper No. 2, cluster 6, this morning members of the Secretariat came to verify whether draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.40, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was ready for action and I said it was, so I wonder why draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.40 is not mentioned under cluster 6 as being ready for action tomorrow.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.40 has not been included because we have not had the time to do so, but we take note of what the representative of the Netherlands has said. The Secretary has indicated that it will certainly be included in cluster 6.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to explain.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Secretariat did not include draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.40 because we are expecting an oral statement from the Executive Office relating to the programme budget implications of the draft resolution, and it is not yet ready. As soon as the oral statement is available, we will include the draft resolution.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does that explanation satisfy the delegation of the Netherlands?

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): We have looked at informal working paper No. 2, and on the second page the title of the draft resolution appears as "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", but the document symbols in the paper are given as A/C.1/56/L.46 and A/C.1/56/L.53, which confuses us. The document symbol for this draft resolution is A/C.1/56/L.50. I should also like to know whether or not we are taking up this draft resolution tomorrow.

The Acting Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to explain.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The title has been incorrectly reflected. It will be corrected as the representative of Nepal has indicated. Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.53 is a document related to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.46, which is already available. We will make a correction and recirculate the document tomorrow.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The United States delegation to the First Committee has arranged for a visit to the site of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center on Thursday, 1 November. The Mayor's office has restricted the number of visitors to 110 because of safety and logistical concerns. Therefore, participation is limited to the first 110 persons to register, with no more than one person per delegation. Please sign up at the back of the conference room with the representative from the United States delegation. At this point two trips are planned, one beginning at 11 a.m. and one beginning at 12 noon. Details concerning where to meet for transportation will be provided tomorrow and Thursday, along with confirmation concerning the participation of those who have signed up.

I should also like to inform members that the African Group of Experts will hold a meeting immediately after this meeting of the First Committee in this conference room.

I should also like to inform members that the organizational session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be held on Friday, 2 November, in Conference Room 1, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.